

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

ANGELINE M. MARSH,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	8:11CV157
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
KARIN L. NOAKES, et al.,	)	MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the Court on its own motion. The above-captioned matter was provisionally filed on May 5, 2011 (Filing No. [1](#)). However, the complaint cannot be further processed until certain technical defects are corrected. To assure further consideration of the complaint, plaintiff must correct the defect listed below. **FAILURE TO CORRECT THE DEFECT WILL RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF THE COMPLAINT.**

To proceed with this matter, plaintiff must submit a signed request to proceed in forma pauperis and an affidavit of poverty in support thereof, or tender the \$350.00 filing fee to the clerk of the court. If plaintiff chooses to submit a request to proceed in forma pauperis, the enclosed forms should be completed and returned to this Court.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff must submit a signed application to proceed in forma pauperis, or pay the \$350.00 filing fee, on or before June 3, 2011.

2. Failure to comply with this memorandum and order will result in the dismissal of this matter without further notice.

3. The clerk of the court is directed to send plaintiff the Form AO240, Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Affidavit.

4. The clerk of the court is directed to set a pro se case management deadline in this matter with the following text:  
June 3, 2011: Check for MIFP or payment.

DATED this 10th day of May, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Lyle E. Strom

---

LYLE E. STROM, Senior Judge  
United States District Court

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the Court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The Court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the Court.